

last 5 years, estimated losses from these fraudulent activities totaled roughly \$418 billion—almost four times as much as the cost of the entire savings and loan crisis to date.

We should act—now—to stop this financial hemorrhage. We cannot afford, and must not tolerate, such larceny on a massive scale.

Mr. President, Senator COHEN has for years lead the fight within this body against health care fraud and abuse. He has worked extremely hard both to expose the fraud rampant throughout our health care system and to craft the legislative means to attach that fraud.

Characteristically, Senator COHEN has approached this issue in a deliberate and thoughtful manner. His recent report on health care fraud, which I strongly urge my colleagues to read, presents a detailed analysis of the factors which permit health care fraud to fester, and, based on that analysis, proposes a specific set of recommendations to reduce the pervasive fraud and abuse.

The amendment before us builds on those recommendations, together with the insights and comments offered by a broad range of parties engaged in the debate over how best to fight health care fraud and abuse. Indeed, I am gratified to note that, throughout the drafting process, Senator COHEN has solicited and—to the extent he could responsibly do so—incorporated comments from all interested parties, be they in Congress, the executive branch, or the private sector.

Mr. President, as Senator COHEN explained in detail in his recent report on health care fraud and abuse, current law is flawed in two fundamental ways.

First, and most importantly, current law fails to provide sufficient means to root out health care fraud.

Senator COHEN's amendment addresses this failing by establishing a new health care fraud statute in title 18 of the United States Code and expanding the capacity of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Attorney General to fight fraud and abuse through the creation of an all-payer national health care fraud program. Law enforcement efforts would be further aided by more thorough data collection, a wider range of penalties, and additional funding through the health care fraud and abuse control account.

Second, current law fails to provide honest citizens who seek to abide by the law with sufficient guidance to delineate the scope of permitted conduct.

Senator COHEN's amendment remedies this by establishing procedures for regulators to solicit and adopt modifications to the current safe harbors to the antifraud statutes which are proposed by the public. Furthermore, the Inspector General, in consultation with the Attorney General, would be directed to issue appropriate interpretive rulings regarding the application of the antifraud laws.

Mr. President, that additional guidance is a key reform. Ironically,

though current law does not effectively curtail billions of dollars worth of fraudulent activity, its uncertain application does impeded certain transactions among law-abiding parties which may be entirely proper. In particular, the current safe harbors are of little use to even the most conscientious parties. Senator COHEN's amendment would provide a means for persons acting in good faith who want to ensure that their conduct is entirely legal to seek specific guidance from the persons responsible for enforcing the law.

In closing, Mr. President, I once again wish to point out that the amendment presented by Senator COHEN is the culmination of many years of effort. I commend Senator COHEN for that effort. I was proud to support this amendment when it was incorporated in the mainstream coalition's health care reform proposal, and I am proud to support it. I regret the fact that Senator COHEN withdrew his amendment and hope this will be a priority for the 104th Congress as it continues health care reform debate.●

#### OUR ECONOMY NEEDS GLOBAL ATTENTION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune on Sunday, September 25, 1994, carried an op-ed piece by Ambassador Pamela Harriman outlining the trade decisions that we have to make and why we should make those decisions affirmatively.

I appreciate this contribution by Ambassador Harriman, and I ask that it be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 25, 1994]

#### OUR ECONOMY NEEDS GLOBAL ATTENTION

(By Pamela Harriman)

Within the next two weeks, Congress will vote on a matter of great importance, one which will shape the economy of the United States and the world far into the future. Yet the issue—approval of the global trade agreement known as the Uruguay Round—has received relatively little attention in these tumultuous months in Washington.

It took seven years of negotiations to bring the Round to a close. During long, hard bargaining, particularly during the concluding weeks, our national interests were pressed strongly and successfully. From my vantage point, representing the United States in France—a crucial player in the world trading system—the very difficulty of the last months of negotiations demonstrates how finely wrought the agreement is, in order to advance both our own economic interests and the interests we share with our trading partners. In the end, we were able to forge an accord because they came to agree with us on three fundamental points:

Growth in international trade is essential for national economic health.

The trading system needs rules for areas such as agriculture, services and intellectual property.

And disagreements over trade will not disappear, even in free trade areas; it is better to have in place a set of principles and a mechanism to resolve disputes.

Any agreement negotiated among 128 nations involves compromise: each of the parties can find things in the package to criticize. But the benefits of the Uruguay Round far outweigh any problems. Congressional approval is critical for two reasons: our economy needs it for future growth and our leadership in the world demands it.

The accord provides a stronger, more reliable trading system that plays to American strengths. It cuts foreign tariffs on manufactured products by more than one third, the largest reduction in history. It greatly expands export opportunities for our farmers by eliminating all non-tariff barriers, including quotas, and significantly reducing tariffs. Firms and workers who make pharmaceutical, entertainment, software and other products gain new protection for their intellectual property. American exporters of services, such as accounting, advertising, computer services, tourism, engineering and construction are guaranteed more open foreign markets as well. Finally, the agreement streamlines the process for dealing with trade disputes, ensuring that all countries live by the same rules—a major objective set for U.S. negotiators by the Congress.

The U.S. recently emerged from a deep recession. Our companies and workers went through a painful restructuring, but they are now the most efficient and competitive in the world.

Predictability, much has been made of the possibility that the World Trade Organization might decide against us in a trade dispute. Some claim will diminish our sovereignty. That is a caricature that membership in the World Trade Organization raised every so often against international advances from the League of Nations to the International Monetary Fund to the UN. In fact, the World Trade Organization rulings will set guidelines for our practices, but will not dictate specific action on our part.

Even more important, a loss of nerve now whether a defeat this year or a delay until next year while the rest of the world moves ahead—would deal a body blow to markets worldwide. Negative repercussions would be felt across the American economy and, indeed, around the world.

Such failure or hesitation would also be read as a retreat from our historical commitment to free trade. The current global trading system arose from the trade liberalization treaties that the United States began negotiating even before World War II, as we recovered from the isolationist disaster of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. We have been at the center of every round of trade negotiations since then because it has been in our nation's interest—and in the world's interest—that we lead.

The trading system of the past was not up to the challenges of an expanding global economy. In the Uruguay Round, sectors that caused the most difficulty, including trade in agriculture, textiles, services and investment, will be dealt with realistically for the first time. We are committed to deal with the remaining challenges, such as aircraft, financial services, steel and audiovisual products.

Many of these are issues of particular difficulty here in France, where some fear their economic system may not have the flexibility necessary to compete on an equal footing in the kind of global market that is emerging. But France has accepted the Uruguay Round accord. It would be much more difficult, if not impossible, to make progress on these and other important issues with the French and with our other trading partners if Congress were to reject it, or treat it as partisan issue. Other great accomplishments—winning WWII, rebuilding Western Europe, staying the course in the Cold War.

even NAFTA—were accomplished by Democrats and Republicans working together. History will judge harshly those who would turn our nation's place in the global economy into a political football.

In France this summer, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of a liberation largely won by the blood and sweat of a generation of Americans convinced that their country needed to play a positive role in global affairs, and optimistic that they could make a real difference. They were right then, and the same principles are true today. The future of the international economy will be molded by our decisions now. Our industry and our agriculture are the world's most efficient. We will prosper in the world, or fall behind. But we cannot opt out. It is time for decision, not delay.\*

#### THE RICKI TIGERT NOMINATION

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] for the outstanding effort she has made with respect to the Ricki Tigert nomination, and I think that was obvious when the votes were taken.

I also want to say to our colleagues on the Republican side, both those who voted for the nomination and those who have agreed, albeit in some cases reluctantly, to the unanimous consent request just entered into to enable this nomination to come to a conclusion tomorrow. I am very grateful for that decision, for that degree of bipartisan effort, to bring this matter to a close and to give Ricki Tigert a fair chance to assume this important position. I think she will be confirmed tomorrow, as she should be.

But, again, I want to congratulate the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Let me also thank the chairman of the Banking Committee, the Senator from Michigan, who has done an outstanding job pushing much legislation through in my 1½-year tenure here, and also for his getting the Tigert nomination through. I appreciate all his help.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### SENATE PILOT TEST OF ON-DEMAND PRINTING

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the Senate will begin a pilot test of on-demand printing this fall and through the first session of the 104th Congress. This program has been put together with the full cooperation and assistance of the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, the Government Printing Office, the Joint Committee on Printing, and the Senate Rules Committee.

Let me briefly explain the problem that hopefully we are going to fix. Title 44 of the United States Code, which deals with public printing, requires the Senate to print a specified number of bills and resolutions, usually several hundred copies. These

numbers were established to ensure full public access to legislative proposals long before we had today's new communications, printing, and computing technologies. Consequently, we are printing large numbers of documents that we never use.

To give you an idea of the magnitude of this problem; at the end of the two sessions of the last Congress the Senate Document Room staff disposed of over 40 million pages of documents that were not used. Mr. President, I say to friends, that required almost 225 cords of wood—or 3,370 trees—covering 9½ acres. That is enough wood to build 11 single family homes.

Hopefully, here is how the program will work. The Government Printing Office will place a copy machine in the Senate Document Room which will be linked by a fiber optic communication line to the central GPO building. When additional copies of a bill, resolution, or other official documents are requested, the text of that document will be communicated electronically from the GPO building to this copy machine and the exact number of needed copies will be produced on the spot. This will eliminate the need to stock large quantities which end up in a recycle bin.

Under section 707 of title 44, the Joint Committee on Printing can limit the number of copies printed in the interest of economy and efficiency. Therefore, I have asked the Secretary of the Senate to examine the required print volumes and provide lower limits to meet known requirements, and to use the on-demand printing facility to supply additional copies when requested.

Next year when we examine the results of the pilot, I am confident that we will have produced a win-win situation. That is, we will give users the documents they need when they need them—we will have had a favorable impact on the environment—and we will have saved the taxpayers a large quantity of money.

Mr. President, I look forward to putting this into effect. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

#### LESSONS LEARNED FROM SOMALIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, today there was a ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery. It was the first anniversary of the 18 rangers that were killed in Somalia and there was a ceremony that commemorated that event. There was a wonderful article in the Wall Street Journal this morning by Larry Joyce whose son was killed on that mission 1 year ago.

I want to take this opportunity, because I think it is very important, to say that we should have learned some lessons from Somalia; and for Larry Joyce to feel that the loss of his son,

Casey, was worth something. I think we are going to have to show Larry Joyce and the parents of those rangers that were killed that, in fact, their deaths will save the lives of others.

I think we need to look at the lesson because we are in a situation that is very similar right now, and we have American troops in harm's way in Haiti. I think we need to make sure that the mission is clear. They have been sent over there on a U.N. resolution to try to bring democracy to Haiti. I want to help the people of Haiti, but I think we must determine if there is a United States security interest that would put our troops in harm's way that is a mission that we have accepted in this country that would allow for the spilling of American blood in Haiti.

I have asked this question. I have asked it on the floor of the United States Senate, and I have asked it many times: What is the mission in Haiti? I think it is time for the President to define the mission.

We were told in briefings that our troops would not get between Haitian-on-Haitian violence, and yet we are seeing on television that there is much violence in Haiti, and we see our soldiers with their bayonets or their guns standing in the middle of this.

I am very concerned about the safety of our troops. I know everyone is. I know all Americans are concerned, and I know that every Member of the U.S. Senate is concerned.

So I just want to say that I think this day, the 1-year anniversary of what happened in Somalia when we lost 18 of our rangers, is an appropriate time to say, "Mr. President, define the mission, tell us what your timetable is and when will we begin to see our troops come home and when will we be finished with this phase of this mission?"

I think it is a very important question, and I want to say that I honor the 18 rangers who were killed in Somalia. I know all Americans do, and I think we should have a moment to say thank you and to say that we want the loss of life in Somalia to make a difference so that our troops are brought home from Haiti so that we will not again send our American troops into harm's way unless there is a United States security interest, unless there is a clear United States mission, and unless we know what our plan is, how our troops go in, what they are going to do when they get there, and how we are going to get them out.

I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Larry Joyce be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1994]

REMEMBER THE LOSSES—AND LESSONS—OF SOMALIA

(By Larry E. Joyce)

On this day in 1906 my father was born in dusty Segeville, Texas. And on the same day